30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10112 tel (212) 408-5100 fax (212) 541-5369

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

John M. Hintz direct tel +1 212 408 1036 jhintz@chadbourne.com

July 26, 2011

BY ECF

The Honorable William M. Conley Chief United States District Judge United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin 120 North Henry Street, Room 320 P.O. Box 432 Madison, WI 53701-0432

Re: Rockwell Automation, Inc. et al. v. WAGO Corporation et al., Civil Action No. 3:10-cv-00718-wmc

Dear Chief Judge Conley:

I am lead counsel for Plaintiffs Rockwell Automation, Inc. and Rockwell Automation Technologies, Inc. (collectively, "Rockwell") in this action.

On December 8, 2010, Defendant WAGO Kontakttechnik GmbH & Co. KG ("WAGO Germany") filed a "Motion by WAGO Kontakttechnik GmbH & Co. KG to Dismiss for Insufficient Service of Process and Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, or in the Alternative, for a More Definite Statement." (Docket Entry # 10). Rockwell timely filed an opposition (Docket Entry # 15), and WAGO Germany timely filed a reply (Docket Entry # 18).

As is evident from the title of WAGO Germany's motion, among other things, WAGO Germany contested the sufficiency by which Rockwell had served process on WAGO Germany. I write to advise the Court that Rockwell has effected service of process on WAGO Germany under the Hague Convention by making delivery of translated, Germanlanguage copies of the Summons, Complaint, and all exhibits (*i.e.*, the patents-in-suit) on the following:

- Sven-Michael Hohorst of Minden, Germany WAGO Germany's counsel previously informed us that Mr. Hohorst is a managing director of WAGO Germany; and
- WAGO Kontakttechnik Beteiligungs GmbH of Domdidier, Switzerland WAGO Germany's counsel previously informed us that this company is the general partner of WAGO Germany.



CHADBOURNE & PARKELLP

The Honorable William M. Conley

-2-

July 26, 2011

Because service under the Hague Convention has been made on WAGO Germany, the portion of WAGO Germany's motion alleging insufficient service of process is moot. The remainder of WAGO Germany's motion, and the motion by Defendant WAGO Corporation for a more definite statement filed on December 8, 2010 (*see* Docket Entry # 7 and Docket Entry # 13, Rockwell's opposition) are fully briefed and awaiting a decision by the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Hintz

Counsel for Plaintiffs

cc: Counsel for Defendants (by email and ECF notice)